Serial No. 10/733,497 Response dated August 1, 2006 Reply to Final Office Action of April 20, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 were previously pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended herein. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Objection

The Office Action indicates that claim 7 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim base but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 and 8-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuriya et al., EP 1 123 844 A1. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, inter alia:

A parking assisting device . . . comprising . . . a controller for comparing a pre-set prescribed yaw angle corresponding to a predetermined vehicle position with the yaw angle of the vehicle detected by the yaw angle detecting means to identify a current position of the vehicle, providing the guidance information for guiding a predetermined parking path to the target parking space by driving the vehicle while maintaining a predetermined steering angle via the guiding means, and displaying on the monitor at least one of a predetermined predicted path and a predetermined predicted parking position on the parking path guided by the guidance information so as to overlap the image obtained by the image capturing means to enable the driver to confirm whether or not the vehicle can be parked into the target parking space by continuing the driving operations in accordance with the guidance information.

Serial No. 10/733,497 Response dated August 1, 2006

Reply to Final Office Action of April 20, 2006

Applicants submit that Kuriya et al. cannot anticipate amended independent claim 1 because the reference does not teach each and every element of amended claim 1. See MPEP § 2131. Kuriya et al. disclose a steering assist device comprising a camera photographing the rearward of a vehicle, a monitor, a steering angle sensor detecting the steered angle of a steering wheel, a display control means that displays the photograph and superimposes thereon steering start guide lines (100, 110), a vehicle width guide line (140), a vehicle locus guide line (20) and a steering amount guide mark (120). See Kuriya et al., p. 4, ¶¶ [0015]–[0019]. The Examiner states in the Final Office Action dated April 20, 2006 that Kuriya et al. disclose on page 4, in paragraphs 23–24, a controller that compares a pre-set prescribed yaw angle to a yaw angle detected by a yaw angle detection means to determine a current vehicle position. See Final Office Action, 4/20/06, p. 3. To the contrary, the embodiment identified by the Examiner on page 4 of Kuriya et al. discloses the use of a steering angle θ, rather than yaw angles, to move the steering amount guide mark (120) along the steering start guide lines (100, 110) and, in conjunction with a CPU 13, calculate a predicted locus of the vehicle.

Moreover, Kuriya et al. are silent as to a steering system that displays a "predetermined predicted path and . . . predetermined predicted parking position on the parking path." Kuriya et al., instead, merely provide a guide for determining when to change the steering angle or the amount of steering. Because a predetermined parking path is not displayed, Kuriya et al. provides no way for outputting guidance information onto the predetermined parking path to allow a driver to confirm whether the vehicle can be parked into a target parking space by continuing the driving operations in accordance with the guidance information.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Kuriya et al. do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in amended independent claim 1 or claims 2–4 and 8–14 depending therefrom. Accordingly, these claims define patentable subject matter over Kuriya et al. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

Serial No. 10/733,497 Response dated August 1, 2006 Reply to Final Office Action of April 20, 2006

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriya et al. in view of Tanaka et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,950,035 B2. Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriya et al. in view of Takagi et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0080877. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken either alone or in combination.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 6 as being obvious over Kuriya et al. in combination with Tanaka et al. See Final Office Action, 4/20/06, p. 7. Kuriya et al. do not teach or suggest Applicants' invention for the reasons set forth above and Tanaka et al. do not remedy these deficiencies. More specifically, the invention of Tanaka et al. is directed to a parking assist system, wherein an input screen displays a reference marker 31, which represents a target parking position and provides for the determination of a relative position between a vehicle and the target parking position. See Tanaka et al., col. 4, ll. 32–40. The reference marker 31 can be moved to an intended parking position by touching arrowheads displayed on an input screen. See Tanaka et al., col. 4, ll. 22–40. Tanaka et al. are silent, however, as to a "controller updating the prescribed yaw angle based on a movement amount of the display of the predicted parking position which is moved by the predicted parking position display moving means and comparing the updated prescribed yaw angle with the yaw angle detected by the yaw angle detecting means to identify the current position of the vehicle." (emphasis added). Tanaka et al. teach away from Applicants' invention by, instead, making the operation of the parking assist system contingent upon the satisfaction of three geometric relationships. See Tanaka et al., col. 4, ll. 55–60.

Further, the Examiner has rejected claim 15 as being obvious over Kuriya et al. in combination with Takagi et al. See Final Office Action, 4/20/06, p. 9. Kuriya et al. do not teach or suggest Applicants' invention for the reasons set forth above and Takagi et al., like Tanaka et al., do not remedy these deficiencies. Takagi et al. disclose a device for monitoring the area around a vehicle, wherein an image display provides a back camera image of a vehicle to the driver during backing up and, subsequently, switches the back image to a side image of the

Docket No. 5000-5135

Serial No. 10/733,497 Response dated August 1, 2006 Reply to Final Office Action of April 20, 2006

vehicle so as to provide a side image to the driver of the outside of a turn. See Takagi et al., p. 2, \P [0019]. However, Takagi et al. do not disclose the display "of a predetermined predicted path and a predetermined predicted parking position on the parking path," wherein it is possible to "enable the driver to confirm whether or not the vehicle can be parked into the target parking space by continuing the driving operations in accordance with the guidance information." In fact, Takagi et al. teach away from a predetermined parking path by describing a parking path calculated from a turning radius R, whereby the turning radius R is estimated based on the position of a shift lever, a steering angle θ , a yaw rate ω and a vehicle speed SPD. In other words, the parking path in Takagi et al. is calculated based on conditions at a particular instance in time. See Takagi et al., p. 3, \P [0041].

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that dependent claims 5–6 and 15 are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken either alone or in combination, and, accordingly, request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: August 1, 2006

Steven F. Meyer

Registration No. 35,613

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 World Financial Center New York, NY 10281-2101 (212) 415-8700 Telephone (212) 415-8701 Facsimile